arXiv:1609.00840v1 [math.AC] 3 Sep 2016

The Second Discriminant of a Univariate Polynomial

Dongming Wang[a,c] and Jing Yang[b]

Abstract

We define the second discriminant D_2 of a univariate polynomial f of degree greater than 2 as the product of the linear forms $2\,r_k - r_i - r_j$ for all triples of roots r_i, r_k, r_j of f with $i < j$ and $j \neq k, k \neq i$. D_2 vanishes if and only if f has at least one root which is equal to the average of two other roots. We show that D_2 can be expressed as the resultant of f and a determinant formed with the derivatives of f, establishing a new relation between the roots and the coefficients of f. We prove several notable properties and present an application of D_2.

Keywords: Determinant, discriminant, polynomial ideal, resultant, root configuration.

1. Introduction

The discriminant of a univariate polynomial $f = f(x)$ may be defined as a function of the coefficients of f in x, whose vanishing is a necessary and sufficient condition for f to have multiple roots for x. The term *discriminant* was used early by Sylvester in [8] and it will be referred to as the *first discriminant* hereinafter. The first discriminant of f contains information about the nature of the roots[1] of f and has played a fundamental role in the study of polynomial equations. It has many remarkable properties [3, 4] and has been used in diverse areas ranging from algebraic geometry and Galois theory to bifurcation analysis and number theory.

To define the first discriminant D_1 of f, one considers the simple form $r_i - r_j$ for any pair of roots r_i, r_j of f with $i \neq j$ and takes the product of all such forms as D_1, which can be expressed as the resultant of f and its derivative. In this paper, we define the *second discriminant* D_2 of f (of degree greater than 2) as the product of the linear forms $2\,r_k - r_i - r_j$ for all triples of roots r_i, r_k, r_j of f with $i < j$ and $j \neq k$, $k \neq i$.

More concretely, let

$$f = x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0 \tag{1}$$

be any univariate polynomial of degree $n \geq 3$ in x with real or complex coefficients. Let $r_1, \ldots, r_n$ be the n roots of f for x over $\mathbb{C}$, the field of complex numbers. By a *symmetric triple* of roots, we mean a triple (r_i, r_k, r_j) of roots of f with $i < j$ and $j \neq k$, $k \neq i$ such

[a]School of Mathematics and Systems Science, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China.
[b]College of Information Science and Engineering, Guangxi University for Nationalities, Nanning 530006, China. *E-mail*: yangjing0930@gmail.com
[c]Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 75794 Paris, France. *E-mail*: Dongming.Wang@lip6.fr

[1]For example, if the discriminant of a cubic polynomial f with real coefficients is positive, then f has no complex root [5].

that $r_k = (r_i + r_j)/2$. Then, obviously, $D_2 = 0$ if and only if f has a symmetric triple of roots. We will show that D_2 can be expressed as the resultant of f and a determinant formed with the derivatives of f, and thus as a polynomial in $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ with rational coefficients. Several other properties of D_2 will also be proved, highlighting the geometric interest of the symmetric triples of roots. The second discriminant D_2 complements the well-known first discriminant D_1 of f in depicting the structural properties such as distribution, position, and configuration of the roots of f.

In the following section, the second discriminant D_2 for an arbitrary univariate polynomial f of degree n is defined formally in terms of the roots of f; some simple properties of D_2 are then proved. In Sections 3 and 4, we show that D_2 as a polynomial in the coefficients of f is irreducible of total degree $3\,(n-1)(n-2)/2$. In Sections 5 and 6, we elaborate D_2 with resultants and ideals from the perspective of modern algebra, which leads to different ways for the construction of D_2. In Section 7, we provide exact formulas for the degrees of some determinant polynomials involved in the construction of D_2. Finally, an application of D_2 to the classification of root configurations is presented and the paper is concluded with some remarks in Section 8.

2. Symmetric Triples of Roots and the Second Discriminant

Let $f \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ be as in (1) with $\deg(f, x) = n \geq 3$ and $r_1, \ldots, r_n$ be the n roots of f over $\mathbb{C}$ as above. Consider any two roots r_i and r_j. We call $(r_i + r_j)/2$ the *average* of r_i and r_j. For any triple $\boldsymbol{r} = (r_i, r_k, r_j)$, where

$$f(r_i) = f(r_j) = f(r_k) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad i < j, j \neq k, k \neq i,$$

if r_k is the average of r_i and r_j, i.e., $r_k = (r_i + r_j)/2$, then $\boldsymbol{r}$ is called a *symmetric triple* of roots of f. We are interested in the condition under which f has symmetric triples of roots.

Recall that the first discriminant of f may be defined as

$$D_1 = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (r_i - r_j)^2 = \pm \prod_{\substack{1 \leq i,\, j \leq n \\ i \neq j}} (r_i - r_j).$$

$D_1 = 0$ if and only if f has a multiple root. To obtain the condition under which f has a symmetric triple of roots, we define the second discriminant D_2 of f as follows:

$$D_2 = \prod_{\substack{1 \leq i,\, j,\, k \leq n \\ i < j,\, j \neq k,\, k \neq i}} (2\, r_k - r_i - r_j), \tag{2}$$

a symmetric polynomial of total degree $n(n-1)(n-2)/2$ in $r_1, \ldots, r_n$. For the sake of simplicity, we shall write $i < j \neq k$ for the range of i, j, k determined by $1 < i, j, k \leq n$ and $i < j$, $j \neq k$, $k \neq i$.

Remark 1. $D_1 = 0$ does not imply $D_2 = 0$, and vice versa.

Proposition 1. (*a*) *If $D_1 = 0$ and $D_2 \neq 0$, then any root of f has multiplicity not greater than 2.*

(*b*) *If $D_1 \neq 0$ and $D_2 = 0$, then there exist pairwise distinct r_i, r_j, r_k with $i < j \neq k$ such that $2\, r_k - r_i - r_j = 0$.*

Proof. (a) Suppose that f has a root with multiplicity $m > 2$ under the condition $D_1 = 0$ and $D_2 \neq 0$, e.g., $r_i = r_j = r_k$ $(i < j \neq k)$. This is then a special case of

$$r_k = (r_i + r_j)/2,$$

so $D_2 = 0$, which leads to contradiction.

(b) $D_1 \neq 0$ implies that r_i, r_j, r_k are pairwise distinct for any $i < j \neq k$ and $D_2 = 0$ implies the existence of r_i, r_j, r_k with $i < j \neq k$ such that $2\,r_k - r_i - r_j = 0$. □

Theorem 1. *$D_2 = 0$ if and only if f has a symmetric triple of roots.*

Proof. ($\Longrightarrow$) $D_2 = 0$ implies that there exist r_i, r_j, r_k such that $r_k = (r_i + r_j)/2$. Thus (r_i, r_k, r_j) is a symmetric triple of roots which we seek for.

($\Longleftarrow$) Suppose that (r_i, r_k, r_j) is a symmetric triple of roots that f has. Then $r_k = (r_i + r_j)/2$. It follows that

$$D_2 = \prod_{i<j\neq k} (2\,r_k - r_i - r_j) = 0.$$

□

The second discriminant D_2 defined above is a polynomial in the roots $r_1, \ldots, r_n$ of f. This polynomial is symmetric with respect to the roots, so D_2 can be expressed as another polynomial in the coefficients $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ of f. We will provide explicit formulas and simple algorithmic approaches for the construction of the polynomial in a_i, together with several properties about D_2.

3. Expression of the Second Discriminant

In this section, we show that the second discriminant D_2 of f can be expressed as a polynomial in $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}$, the coefficients of f. The expression of D_2 we have discovered as the resultant of f and the determinant of a shifting matrix formed with the derivatives $f^{(1)}, \ldots, f^{(n)}$ of f, given in the following theorem, appears pretty amazing. It is puzzling how and why the derivatives of f get occurred in H so structurally. We will answer this question in Lemma 6 by linking H to the resultant of two other polynomials derived from f.

As usual, denote by $\det(M)$ the determinant of any square matrix M and by $\mathrm{res}(f, g, x)$ the Sylvester resultant of any two polynomials f and g with respect to x.

Theorem 2. *The second discriminant D_2 of f is equal to the resultant of f and a determinant H formed with the derivatives of f with respect to x. More precisely,*

$$D_2 = \mathrm{res}(f, H, x),$$

where H is the $(n-2)$th leading principal minor of the following matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{f^{(2)}}{2!} & \frac{f^{(4)}}{4!} & \frac{f^{(6)}}{6!} & \cdots\cdots & \frac{f^{(2l)}}{(2l)!} & \cdots\cdots \\ \frac{f^{(1)}}{1!} & \frac{f^{(3)}}{3!} & \frac{f^{(5)}}{5!} & \cdots\cdots & \frac{f^{(2l-1)}}{(2l-1)!} & \cdots\cdots \\ 0 & \frac{f^{(2)}}{2!} & \frac{f^{(4)}}{4!} & \cdots\cdots & \frac{f^{(2l-2)}}{(2l-2)!} & \cdots\cdots \\ 0 & \frac{f^{(1)}}{1!} & \frac{f^{(3)}}{3!} & \cdots\cdots & \frac{f^{(2l-3)}}{(2l-3)!} & \cdots\cdots \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{f^{(2)}}{2!} & \cdots\cdots & \frac{f^{(2l-3)}}{(2l-3)!} & \cdots\cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix} \tag{3}$$

and $f^{(\imath)}$ denotes the $\imath$th derivative of f.

Note that

$$\mathrm{res}(f, H, x) = \prod_{k=1}^{n} H(r_k),$$

where $r_1, \ldots, r_n$ are the n roots of f as before. To prove Theorem 2, we only need to show that for each k, $H(r_k)$ is the product of $2\,r_k - r_i - r_j$ for all i, j with $i < j \neq k$. The proof will be divided into two parts. In the first part, it is shown that for any i, j with $i < j \neq k$, $2\,r_k - r_i - r_j$ is a divisor of $H(r_k)$ (see Lemmas 1 and 2). The second part is devoted to proving that the leading term of $H(r_k)$ with respect to r_k is $(2\,r_k)^{\frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}}$ (see Lemma 3).

Lemma 1. *If $r_k = (r_i + r_j)/2$ for $i < j \neq k$, then $H(r_k) = 0$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that the lemma holds for $k = 1$, $i = 2$, and $j = 3$. Denote by Ω_l^γ the set of all γ-tuples obtained from $(l, \ldots, n)$ by deleting $n - \gamma$ components, where l is a positive integer not greater than n. Let $b_\imath = x - r_\imath$ for $\imath = 1, \ldots, n$. By calculus, it is easy to verify that

$$\frac{f^{(\jmath)}}{\jmath!} = \begin{cases} \sum_{(\imath_1, \ldots, \imath_{n-\jmath}) \in \Omega_1^{n-\jmath}} b_{\imath_1} \cdots b_{\imath_{n-\jmath}}, & \jmath = 0, \ldots, n-1; \\ 1, & \jmath = n. \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

Let $c_\imath = r_1 - r_\imath$ for $\imath = 2, \ldots, n$ and suppose that $r_1 = (r_2 + r_3)/2$. Then $c_2 + c_3 = 0$. Substituting $x = r_1$ into (4) and observing that any term $b_{\imath_1} \cdots b_{\imath_{n-\jmath}}$ involving $x - r_1$ vanishes at $x = r_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f^{(\jmath)}}{\jmath!}\Big|_{x=r_1} &= \sum_{(\imath_1, \ldots, \imath_{n-\jmath}) \in \Omega_1^{n-\jmath}} b_{\imath_1} \cdots b_{\imath_{n-\jmath}}\Big|_{x=r_1} \\ &= t_{n-\jmath} + c_2 c_3 t_{n-\jmath-2} + c_2 t_{n-\jmath-1} + c_3 t_{n-\jmath-1} \\ &= c_2 c_3 t_{n-\jmath-2} + (c_2 + c_3) t_{n-\jmath-1} + t_{n-\jmath} \\ &= -c_2^2 t_{n-\jmath-2} + t_{n-\jmath}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$t_{n-\jmath} = \begin{cases} \sum_{(\imath_1, \ldots, \imath_{n-\jmath}) \in \Omega_4^{n-\jmath}} c_{\imath_1} \cdots c_{\imath_{n-\jmath}} & \text{if } 3 \le \jmath \le n-1; \\ 1 & \text{if } \jmath = n; \\ 0 & \text{if } \jmath \le 2 \text{ or } \jmath \ge n+1. \end{cases}$$

Substitution of t_{n-j} into $H(r_1)$ yields

$$H(r_1) = \begin{vmatrix} -c_2^2 t_{n-4} & -c_2^2 t_{n-6} + t_{n-4} & -c_2^2 t_{n-8} + t_{n-6} & \cdots\cdots & -c_2^2 t_{n-2j-2} + t_{n-2j} \\ -c_2^2 t_{n-3} & -c_2^2 t_{n-5} + t_{n-3} & -c_2^2 t_{n-7} + t_{n-5} & \cdots\cdots & -c_2^2 t_{n-2j-1} + t_{n-2j+1} \\ 0 & -c_2^2 t_{n-4} & -c_2^2 t_{n-6} + t_{n-4} & \cdots\cdots & -c_2^2 t_{n-2j} + t_{n-2j+2} \\ 0 & -c_2^2 t_{n-3} & -c_2^2 t_{n-5} + t_{n-3} & \cdots\cdots & -c_2^2 t_{n-2j+1} + t_{n-2j+3} \\ 0 & 0 & -c_2^2 t_{n-4} + t_{n-2} & \cdots\cdots & -c_2^2 t_{n-2j+2} + t_{n-2j+4} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots\cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots\cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots\cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots\cdots & 0 \end{vmatrix}$$

$$\begin{vmatrix} \cdots\cdots & 0 & \cdots\cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \cdots\cdots & 0 & \cdots\cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \cdots\cdots & 0 & \cdots\cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \cdots\cdots & 0 & \cdots\cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \cdots\cdots & 0 & \cdots\cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \cdots\cdots & -c_2^2 t_{2j-6} + t_{2j-4} & \cdots\cdots & -c_2^2 + t_2 & 1 & 0 \\ \cdots\cdots & -c_2^2 t_{2j-5} + t_{2j-3} & \cdots\cdots & -c_2^2 t_1 + t_3 & t_1 & 0 \\ \cdots\cdots & -c_2^2 t_{2j-4} + t_{2j-2} & \cdots\cdots & -c_2^2 t_2 + t_4 & -c_2^2 + t_2 & 1 \\ \cdots\cdots & -c_2^2 t_{2j-3} + t_{2j-1} & \cdots\cdots & -c_2^2 t_3 + t_5 & -c_2^2 t_1 + t_3 & t_1 \end{vmatrix}.$$

For each $\imath = n-2, \ldots, 2$, add the $\imath$th column multiplied by c_2^2 to the $(\imath-1)$th column of $H(r_1)$ iteratively. It follows that

$$H(r_1) = \begin{vmatrix} 0 & t_{n-4} & t_{n-6} & \cdots\cdots & t_{n-2\jmath} & \cdots\cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & t_{n-3} & t_{n-5} & \cdots\cdots & t_{n-2\jmath+1} & \cdots\cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & t_{n-4} & \cdots\cdots & t_{n-2\jmath+2} & \cdots\cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & t_{n-3} & \cdots\cdots & t_{n-2\jmath+3} & \cdots\cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots\cdots & \vdots & \cdots\cdots & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots\cdots & \vdots & \cdots\cdots & t_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots\cdots & \vdots & \cdots\cdots & t_2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots\cdots & \vdots & \cdots\cdots & t_3 & t_1 \end{vmatrix} = 0.$$

□

Lemma 2. *For any $i < j \neq k$, the linear form $2\,r_k - r_i - r_j$ divides $H(r_k)$.*

Proof. Let $r_k = (r_i + r_j)/2$, where i and j are arbitrary but fixed. By Lemma 1, $H(r_k) = 0$. It follows that

$$[r_k - (r_i + r_j)/2] \mid H(r_k), \quad \text{or} \quad (2\,r_k - r_i - r_j) \mid H(r_k)$$

over $\mathbb{Q}$ (the field of rational numbers). □

Note that $u \mid v$ stands for "u divides v" as usual. Let $c_\imath = r_1 - r_\imath$ for $\imath = 2, \ldots, n$. It is easy to verify that

$$\left.\frac{f^{(\jmath)}}{\jmath\,!}\right|_{x=r_1} = t^*_{n-\jmath}, \tag{5}$$

where

$$t^*_{n-\jmath} = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\sum_{(\imath_1,\ldots,\imath_{n-\jmath})\in\Omega_2^{n-\jmath}} c_{\imath_1}\cdots c_{\imath_{n-\jmath}} & \text{if } 1 \le \jmath \le n-1; \\ 1 & \text{if } \jmath = n. \end{cases}$$

Let $M(r_1)$ be the matrix obtained from M in (2) by replacing x with r_1. Then

$$M(r_1) = \begin{pmatrix} t^*_{n-2} & t^*_{n-4} & t^*_{n-6} & \cdots\cdots & t^*_{n-2\jmath} & \cdots\cdots \\ t^*_{n-1} & t^*_{n-3} & t^*_{n-5} & \cdots\cdots & t^*_{n-2\jmath+1} & \cdots\cdots \\ 0 & t^*_{n-2} & t^*_{n-4} & \cdots\cdots & t^*_{n-2\jmath+2} & \cdots\cdots \\ 0 & t^*_{n-1} & t^*_{n-3} & \cdots\cdots & t^*_{n-2\jmath+3} & \cdots\cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $C_{n-1}^{n-\jmath} r_1^{n-\jmath}$ is the leading coefficient of $t^*_{n-\jmath}$ with respect to r_1, $t^*_{n-\jmath}$ can be written as

$$t^*_{n-\jmath} = C_{n-1}^{n-\jmath} r_1^{n-\jmath} + \mathcal{O}(r_1^{n-\jmath}),$$

where $\mathcal{O}(r_1^{n-\jmath})$ denotes terms of degree less than $n-\jmath$ in r_1. Now let $M_n(r_1)$ be the $(n-2)$th leading principal minor of the matrix obtained from $M(r_1)$ by replacing each entry $t^*_{n-\jmath}$ with $C_{n-1}^{n-\jmath} r_1^{n-\jmath}$. Then

$$M_n(r_1) = \Big|\boldsymbol{m}_1(r_1), \ldots, \boldsymbol{m}_\imath(r_1), \ldots, \boldsymbol{m}_{n-2}(r_1)\Big|,$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{m}_\imath(r_1)=\begin{cases}\Big(C_{n-1}^{n-2\imath}r_1^{n-2\imath},\ldots,C_{n-1}^{n-2\imath+\jmath}r_1^{n-2\imath+\jmath},\ldots,\underbrace{0,\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots,0}_{\max(n-2\imath-2,0)\text{ terms}}\Big)^T\\ \qquad\qquad\text{if }\ \imath\le\left\lceil\dfrac{n-2}{2}\right\rceil\ \text{ and } 0\le\jmath\le\min(n-3,2\,\imath-1);\\ \Big(\underbrace{0,\ldots\ldots\ldots,0}_{2\imath-n\text{ terms}},C_{n-1}^0r_1^0,\ldots,C_{n-1}^{\jmath}r_1^{\jmath},\ldots\Big)^T\\ \qquad\qquad\text{if }\ \imath>\left\lceil\dfrac{n-2}{2}\right\rceil\ \text{ and } 0\le\jmath\le 2\,n-2\,\imath-3.\end{cases}$$

Therefore, $M_n(r_1)$ has the following form:

$$M_n(r_1)=\begin{vmatrix} C_{n-1}^{n-2}r_1^{n-2} & C_{n-1}^{n-4}r_1^{n-4} & C_{n-1}^{n-6}r_1^{n-6} & \cdots\cdots & C_{n-1}^{n-2\jmath}r_1^{n-2\jmath} & \cdots\cdots\\ C_{n-1}^{n-1}r_1^{n-1} & C_{n-1}^{n-3}r_1^{n-3} & C_{n-1}^{n-5}r_1^{n-5} & \cdots\cdots & C_{n-1}^{n-2\jmath+1}r_1^{n-2\jmath+1} & \cdots\cdots\\ 0 & C_{n-1}^{n-2}r_1^{n-2} & C_{n-1}^{n-4}r_1^{n-4} & \cdots\cdots & C_{n-1}^{n-2\jmath+2}r_1^{n-2\jmath+2} & \cdots\cdots\\ 0 & C_{n-1}^{n-1}r_1^{n-1} & C_{n-1}^{n-3}r_1^{n-3} & \cdots\cdots & C_{n-1}^{n-2\jmath+3}r_1^{n-2\jmath+3} & \cdots\cdots\\ 0 & 0 & C_{n-1}^{n-2}r_1^{n-2} & \cdots\cdots & C_{n-1}^{n-2\jmath+4}r_1^{n-2\jmath+4} & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots\\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots\end{vmatrix}.$$

Apparently, the above expression for $M_n(r_1)$ remains valid when r_1 is substituted by r_k for any $k>1$.

Lemma 3. *$M_n(r_k)=(2\,r_k)^{\frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}}$ for $k=1,\ldots,n$.*

Proof. We prove the lemma for $k=1$. The proof applies for any $k\neq 1$. Substitution of $C_n^\imath=C_{n-1}^\imath+C_{n-1}^{\imath-1}$ into $\boldsymbol{m}_\imath(r_k)$ yields

$$\boldsymbol{m}_\imath(r_k)=\begin{cases}\Big((C_{n-2}^{n-2\imath}+C_{n-2}^{n-2\imath-1})r_k^{n-2\imath},\ldots,(C_{n-2}^{n-2\imath+\jmath}+C_{n-2}^{n-2\imath+\jmath-1})r_k^{n-2\imath+\jmath},\\ \qquad\qquad\ldots,\ \underbrace{0,\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots,0}_{\max(n-2\imath-2,0)\text{ terms}}\Big)^T\\ \qquad\qquad\text{if }\ \imath\le\left\lceil\dfrac{n-2}{2}\right\rceil\ \text{ and } 0\le\jmath\le\min(n-3,2\,\imath-1);\\ \Big(\underbrace{0,\ldots\ldots\ldots,0}_{2\imath-n\text{ terms}},C_{n-2}^0r_k^0,\ldots,(C_{n-2}^{\jmath}+C_{n-2}^{\jmath-1})r_k^{\jmath},\ldots\Big)^T\\ \qquad\qquad\text{if }\ \imath>\left\lceil\dfrac{n-2}{2}\right\rceil\ \text{ and } 0\le\jmath\le 2\,n-2\,\imath-3,\end{cases}$$

where $C_{n-2}^\jmath=0$ for $\jmath<0$ and $\jmath>n-2$, and $\lceil\gamma\rceil$ denotes the smallest integer that is not less than the rational number γ. For any positive integer l, denote by co_l the lth column and by

ro_l the lth row of this matrix. Then

$$M_n(r_k) \overset{\mathrm{co}_i+\mathrm{co}_{i+1}\cdot r_k^2}{\underset{i=n-3,\ldots,1}{=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=}}$$

$$\begin{vmatrix}
\sum_{i=0}^{n-2} C_{n-2}^i r_k^{n-2} & \sum_{i=0}^{n-4} C_{n-2}^i r_k^{n-4} & \cdots\cdots & \sum_{i=1}^{n-2j} C_{n-2}^i r_k^{n-2j} & \cdots\cdots \\
\sum_{i=0}^{n-2} C_{n-2}^i r_k^{n-1} & \sum_{i=0}^{n-3} C_{n-2}^i r_k^{n-3} & \cdots\cdots & \sum_{i=1}^{n-2j+1} C_{n-2}^i r_k^{n-2j+1} & \cdots\cdots \\
\sum_{i=0}^{n-2} C_{n-2}^i r_k^{n} & \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} C_{n-2}^i r_k^{n-2} & \cdots\cdots & \sum_{i=1}^{n-2j+2} C_{n-2}^i r_k^{n-2j+2} & \cdots\cdots \\
\sum_{i=0}^{n-2} C_{n-2}^i r_k^{n+1} & \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} C_{n-2}^i r_k^{n-1} & \cdots\cdots & \sum_{i=1}^{n-2j+3} C_{n-2}^i r_k^{n-2j+3} & \cdots\cdots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots
\end{vmatrix}
\overset{\mathrm{ro}_i-\mathrm{ro}_{i-1}\cdot r_k}{\underset{i=2,\ldots,n-2}{=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=}}$$

$$\begin{vmatrix}
\sum_{i=0}^{n-2} C_{n-2}^i r_k^{n-2} & \sum_{i=0}^{n-4} C_{n-2}^i r_k^{n-4} & \sum_{i=0}^{n-6} C_{n-2}^{n-6} r_k^{n-6} & \cdots\cdots & \sum_{i=0}^{n-2j} C_{n-2}^{n-2j} r_k^{n-2j} & \cdots\cdots \\
0 & C_{n-2}^{n-3} r_k^{n-3} & C_{n-2}^{n-5} r_k^{n-5} & \cdots\cdots & C_{n-2}^{n-2j+1} r_k^{n-2j+1} & \cdots\cdots \\
0 & C_{n-2}^{n-2} r_k^{n-2} & C_{n-2}^{n-4} r_k^{n-4} & \cdots\cdots & C_{n-2}^{n-2j+2} r_k^{n-2j+2} & \cdots\cdots \\
0 & 0 & C_{n-2}^{n-3} r_k^{n-3} & \cdots\cdots & C_{n-2}^{n-2j+3} r_k^{n-2j+3} & \cdots\cdots \\
0 & 0 & C_{n-2}^{n-2} r_k^{n-2} & \cdots\cdots & C_{n-2}^{n-2j+4} r_k^{n-2j+4} & \cdots\cdots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots
\end{vmatrix}$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} C_{n-2}^i r_k^{n-2} \cdot M_{n-1}(r_k) = (2\,r_k)^{n-2} \cdot M_{n-1}(r_k).$$

Since $M_3(r_k) = 2\,r_k$, it is easy to verify that

$$M_n(r_k) = (2\,r_k)^{\frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}}$$

by induction. □

Proof of Theorem 2. By Lemma 2,

$$\left[\prod_{i<j\neq k}^{n} (2\,r_k - r_i - r_j)\right] \;\Big|\; H(r_k).$$

Hence there exists a polynomial $P = P(r_1, \ldots, r_n)$ such that

$$H(r_k) = P \prod_{i<j\neq k}^{n} (2\,r_k - r_i - r_j).$$

Observe that both of the leading terms of $\prod_{i<j\neq k}^{n} (2\,r_k - r_i - r_j)$ and H with respect to r_k is equal to $(2\,r_k)^{\frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}}$. This implies that $P = 1$, so that

$$H(r_k) = \prod_{i<j\neq k}^{n} (2\,r_k - r_i - r_j).$$

Therefore,

$$\operatorname{res}(f, H, x) = \prod_{k=1}^{n} H(r_k) = \prod_{i<j\neq k} (2\,r_k - r_i - r_j) = D_2.$$

□

4. Irreducibility and Degree of the Second Discriminant

Using Theorem 2, one can easily verify that

(1) for $n = 3$, $D_2 = -2\,a_2^3 + 9\,a_1a_2 - 27\,a_0$;

(2) for $n = 4$, D_2 is an irreducible polynomial of total degree 9, and more explicitly:

$$\begin{aligned} D_2 =& 216\,a_0a_3^8 - 72\,a_1a_2a_3^7 + 16\,a_2^3a_3^6 - 2304\,a_0a_2a_3^6 + 72\,a_1^2a_3^6 + 672\,a_1a_2^2a_3^5 - 144\,a_2^4a_3^4 \\ &+ 5310\,a_0a_1a_3^5 + 7446\,a_0a_2^2a_3^4 - 2346\,a_1^2a_2a_3^4 - 1278\,a_1a_2^3a_3^3 + 324\,a_2^5a_3^2 \\ &- 9675\,a_0^2a_3^4 - 28950\,a_0a_1a_2a_3^3 - 6804\,a_0a_2^3a_3^2 + 1658\,a_1^3a_3^3 + 9423\,a_1^2a_2^2a_3^2 - 1296\,a_1a_2^4a_3 \\ &+ 51600\,a_0^2a_2a_3^2 + 31890\,a_0a_1^2a_3^2 + 19440\,a_0a_1a_2^2a_3 + 1296\,a_0a_2^4 - 17262\,a_1^3a_2a_3 + 972\,a_1^2a_2^3 \\ &- 120000\,a_0^2a_1a_3 - 28800\,a_0^2a_2^2 - 5040\,a_0a_1^2a_2 + 9261\,a_1^4 + 160000\,a_0^3; \end{aligned}$$

(3) for $n = 5$, D_2 is an irreducible polynomial of total degree 18, consisting of 521 terms, in $a_0, \ldots, a_4$.

In what follows, we prove that D_2 is an irreducible polynomial of total degree $3\,(n-1)(n-2)/2$ in $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ for any $n \geq 3$. For this purpose, let $s_i = \sum r_{k_1} \cdots r_{k_i}$ be the sum of all the possible, distinct products of i elements taken from $r_1, \ldots, r_n$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. The sum s_i of products is called the *elementary symmetric polynomial* of degree i in $r_1, \ldots, r_n$. It is easy to show that the Vieta formula $a_{n-i} = (-1)^i s_i$ holds for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

Proposition 2. *$D_2(a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{Q}[a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}]$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$.*

Proof. Let $P \in \mathbb{Q}[a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}]$ be a nonconstant irreducible polynomial and suppose that $P \mid D_2$. We show that $D_2 \mid P$.

Substituting Vieta's formula $a_{n-i} = (-1)^i \sum r_{k_1} \cdots r_{k_i}$ into P and D_2, we obtain two symmetric polynomials $\bar{P}$ and $\bar{D}_2$ in $\mathbb{Q}[r_1, \ldots, r_n]$, respectively. Then $\bar{P} = 0$ is equivalent to $P = 0$, and so is $\bar{D}_2$ to D_2. Since P is nonconstant, so is $\bar{P}$. As $P \mid D_2$, $\bar{P} \mid \bar{D}_2$; so $\bar{P}$ contains at least one irreducible factor of $\bar{D}_2$, say $2\,r_1 - r_2 - r_3$. Therefore, every $2\,r_k - r_i - r_j$ is a factor of $\bar{P}$ because $\bar{P}$ is symmetric with respect to $r_1, \ldots, r_n$. It follows that $\bar{D}_2 \mid \bar{P}$. Hence $\bar{D}_2$ and $\bar{P}$ differ only by a nonzero constant factor, and so do D_2 and P. Therefore, $D_2 \mid P$ and thus D_2 is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$. □

For simplicity, we write $\boldsymbol{a}$ for $(a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1})$ and $\deg(F, \boldsymbol{a})$ for the total degree of F in $\boldsymbol{a}$ from now on.

Proposition 3. $\deg(D_2, \boldsymbol{a}) = 3\,(n-1)(n-2)/2$.

Proof. Set $B_0 = D_2$. For $i = 1, \ldots, n$, let C_i be the homogeneous part of B_{i-1} of the highest total degree in $\boldsymbol{a}^+ = (a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}, r_1)$ and let B_i be obtained from C_i by substituting Vieta's formula $a_{n-i} = (-1)^i \sum r_{k_1} \cdots r_{k_i} = U_{n-i} r_1 + V_{n-i}$, where $U_{n-i} \neq 0$ and $\deg(U_{n-i}, r_1) = \deg(V_{n-i}, r_1) = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} C_i = S_{n-i} a_{n-i}^{N_i} + T_{n-i} = S_{n-i} (U_{n-i} r_1 + V_{n-i})^{N_i} + T_{n-i} = B_i, \\ S_{n-i} U_{n-i}^{N_i} r_1^{N_i} = C_{i+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $N_i = \deg(C_i, a_{n-i})$, S_{n-i} is the leading coefficient of C_i with respect to a_{n-i}, and $S_{n-i}U_{n-i} \neq 0$. Therefore, the total degrees of C_i, B_i, C_{i+1} in $\boldsymbol{a}^+$ remain the same for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, so $\deg(C_1, \boldsymbol{a}^+) = \deg(C_n, \boldsymbol{a}^+)$. Note that C_n is the leading term of D_2, expressed in terms of the roots $r_1, \ldots, r_n$ as in (2), with respect to r_1 and $\deg(C_n, \boldsymbol{a}^+) = \deg(C_n, r_1) = 3\,(n-1)(n-2)/2$. Thus $\deg(D_2, \boldsymbol{a}) = \deg(C_1, \boldsymbol{a}^+) = 3\,(n-1)(n-2)/2$ and the proposition is proved. □

5. The Second Discriminant with Resultants

The following three polynomials will play a significant role in this and later sections:

$$f_1(x,y) = \frac{f(y) - f(x)}{y - x}, \quad f_2(x,y) = \frac{f\left(\dfrac{x+y}{2}\right) - f(x)}{\dfrac{y-x}{2}},$$

$$f_3(x,y) = \frac{f(y) - 2\,f\left(\dfrac{x+y}{2}\right) + f(x)}{\dfrac{(y-x)^2}{2}}.$$

The rational functions on the right-hand side of the above equalities can all be simplified to polynomials in x and y.

Proposition 4. $\operatorname{res}(f, \operatorname{res}(f_1, f_2, y), x) = 0$ *if and only if* $D_1 D_2 = 0$.

Proof. ($\Longleftarrow$) Let

$$R_1(x) = \operatorname{res}(f_1, f_2, y), \quad R_2 = \operatorname{res}(f, R_1, x).$$

We want to show that, if $D_1 D_2 = 0$, then there exist r_i and r_j such that

$$f(r_i) = f(r_j) = 0, \quad f_1(r_i, r_j) = 0, \quad f_2(r_i, r_j) = 0. \tag{6}$$

For this purpose, first suppose that $D_1 = 0$. Then there exist $r_i = r_j, i \neq j$, such that $f(r_i) = f(r_j) = 0$ and $f'(r_i) = f'(r_j) = 0$ (where $'$ is the derivation operator). Note that

$$f_1(x,y) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{f^{(k+1)}(x)}{(k+1)!}(y-x)^k, \quad f_2(x,y) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{f^{(k+1)}(x)}{(k+1)!}\left(\frac{y-x}{2}\right)^k.$$

Substitution of $x = r_i$ and $y = r_j$ into the above expressions shows that (6) holds in this case.

Now suppose that $D_2 = 0$ and $D_1 \neq 0$. Then there exist $r_i \neq r_j$ such that $f(r_i) = f(r_j) = 0$ and $f\left(\frac{r_i + r_j}{2}\right) = 0$. It follows that

$$f_1(r_i, r_j) = \frac{f(r_j) - f(r_i)}{r_j - r_i} = 0, \quad f_2(r_i, r_j) = \frac{f\left(\dfrac{r_i + r_j}{2}\right) - f(r_i)}{\dfrac{r_j - r_i}{2}} = 0.$$

Thus (6) holds as well.

In any case, $f_1(r_i, y)$ and $f_2(r_i, y)$ have a common zero r_j for y. Therefore,

$$R_1(r_i) = \operatorname{res}(f_1(r_i, y), f_2(r_i, y), y) = 0.$$

Hence $f(x)$ and $R_1(x)$ have a common root r_i for x. This implies that $R_2 = 0$.

($\Longrightarrow$) $\operatorname{res}(f, \operatorname{res}(f_1, f_2, y), x) = 0$ implies that there exist r_i and r_j, $i < j$, such that

$$f(r_i) = 0, \quad f_1(r_i, r_j) = f_2(r_i, r_j) = 0.$$

Thus $f(r_j) = f_1(r_i, r_j)(r_j - r_i) + f(r_i) = 0$.

If $r_j = r_i$, then $f(x)$ has a multiple root and thus $D_1 = 0$. Otherwise,

$$f_2(r_i, r_j) = 2\left[f\left(\frac{r_i + r_j}{2}\right) - f(r_i)\right] \Big/ (r_j - r_i) = 0$$

implies that $f\left(\frac{r_i+r_j}{2}\right) = 0$, so f has three roots, which form a symmetric triple. Therefore $D_2 = 0$. □

Using similar ideas, we can prove the following proposition, which shows how to construct D_2 via resultant computation twice.

Proposition 5. $\operatorname{res}(f, \operatorname{res}(f_1, f_3, y), x) = 0$ *if and only if* $D_2 = 0$.

Proof. ($\Longleftarrow$) Let

$$F(x) = \operatorname{res}(f_1, f_3, y), \quad E = \operatorname{res}(f, F, x).$$

We show that, if $D_2 = 0$, then there exist r_i and r_j such that

$$f(r_i) = f(r_j) = 0, \quad f_1(r_i, r_j) = 0, \quad f_3(r_i, r_j) = 0. \tag{7}$$

First suppose that there exist $r_i = r_j = r_k$, $i < j \neq k$, such that $f(r_i) = f(r_j) = f(r_k) = 0$. Then $f'(r_i) = f''(r_i) = 0$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x, y) &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{f^{(k+1)}(x)}{(k+1)!}(y - x)^k, \\ f_3(x, y) &= \frac{f_1 - f_2}{\frac{y-x}{2}} = \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{f^{(k+1)}(x)}{(k+1)!}(y-x)^k - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{f^{(k+1)}(x)}{(k+1)!}\left(\frac{y-x}{2}\right)^k}{\frac{y-x}{2}} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \left(2 - \frac{1}{2^k}\right) \frac{f^{(k+2)}(x)}{(k+2)!}(y - x)^k. \end{aligned}$$

Substitution of $x = r_i$ and $y = r_j$ into the above expressions shows that (7) holds in this case.

Suppose otherwise that there exist $r_i \neq r_j$ such that $f(r_i) = f(r_j) = 0$ and $f((r_i + r_j)/2) = 0$. Then it follows from $D_2 = 0$ that

$$f_1(r_i, r_j) = \frac{f(r_j) - f(r_i)}{r_j - r_i} = 0, \quad f_3(r_i, r_j) = \frac{f(r_j) - 2f\left(\frac{r_i + r_j}{2}\right) + f(r_i)}{\frac{(r_j - r_i)^2}{2}} = 0,$$

so (7) holds as well.

In any case, $f_1(r_i, y)$ and $f_3(r_i, y)$ have a common zero r_j for y. Therefore,

$$F(r_i) = \operatorname{res}(f_1(r_i, y), f_3(r_i, y), y) = 0.$$

Hence $f(x)$ and $F(x)$ have a common root r_i for x. This implies that $E = 0$.

($\Longrightarrow$) $\operatorname{res}(f, \operatorname{res}(f_1, f_3, y), x) = 0$ implies that there exist r_i and r_j, $i < j$, such that

$$f(r_i) = 0, \quad f_1(r_i, r_j) = f_3(r_i, r_j) = 0.$$

Moreover, $f(r_i) = 0$ and $f_1(r_i, r_j) = 0$ imply that $f(r_j) = 0$.

Consider first the case when $r_i = r_j$. In this case, $D_1 = 0$ and thus $f'(r_i) = 0$. The following calculation shows that $f''(r_i) = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
f''(r_i) = & \lim_{x \to r_i} \frac{f'\left(\frac{x + r_i}{2}\right) - f'(r_i)}{\frac{x - r_i}{2}} \\
= & \lim_{x \to r_i} \frac{\frac{f(x) - f\left(\frac{x + r_i}{2}\right)}{\frac{x - r_i}{2}} - \frac{f\left(\frac{x + r_i}{2}\right) - f(r_i)}{\frac{x - r_i}{2}}}{\frac{x - r_i}{2}} \\
= & \; 2 \lim_{x \to r_i} \frac{f(x) + f(r_i) - 2\, f\left(\frac{x + r_i}{2}\right)}{\frac{(x - r_i)^2}{2}} \\
= & \; 2 \lim_{x \to r_i} f_3(x, r_i) = \; 2\, f_3(r_i, r_j) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there exists an r_k such that $k \neq i$, $k \neq j$ and $r_k = r_i = r_j$, which implies that $2\, r_k - r_i - r_j = 0$. Hence $D_2 = 0$.

Now consider the case when $r_j \neq r_i$. In this case,

$$f_3(r_i, r_j) = \left[f(r_i) + f(r_j) - 2\, f\left(\frac{r_i + r_j}{2}\right) \right] \Big/ \frac{(r_j - r_i)^2}{2} = 0$$

implies that $f\left((r_i + r_j)/2\right) = 0$, so $x = (r_i + r_j)/2$ is a root of f. Therefore $D_2 = 0$. □

Since D_2 is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$, there exist a positive integer q and a nonzero constant $c \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$D_2^q = c \cdot \operatorname{res}(f, \operatorname{res}(f_1, f_3, y), x).$$

In what follows, we prove that $q = 2$. For simplicity, we write F for $\operatorname{res}(f_1, f_3, y)$ and E for $\operatorname{res}(f, \operatorname{res}(f_1, f_3, y), x)$.

Theorem 3. *$E = c\, D_2^2$, where c is a nonzero rational number.*

The proof of this theorem requires Lemmas 4 and 11, of which the latter shows that $\deg(E, \boldsymbol{a}) \leq 3\,(n-1)(n-2) + 2\,(n-2)$.

Lemma 4. *For any k, j with $1 < k \neq j$, $r_1 - 2\, r_k + r_j$ divides $F(r_1)$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that $F(r_1) = 0$ when $r_1 = 2\, r_k - r_j$ for any fixed k, j satisfying $1 < k \neq j$.

According to the theory of resultants [7, pp. 228f], there exist polynomials $A_1(x, y)$ and $A_3(x, y)$ such that

$$F(x) = A_1(x, y) f_1(x, y) + A_3(x, y) f_3(x, y).$$

Suppose that $r_j \neq r_1$. Since $f(r_1) = f(r_k) = f(r_j) = 0$, substitution of $x = r_1$ and $y = r_j$ into f_1 and f_3 yields

$$f_1(r_1, r_j) = \frac{f(r_j) - f(r_1)}{r_j - r_1} = 0,$$
$$f_3(r_1, r_j) = \frac{f(r_j) - 2\, f\left(\dfrac{r_1 + r_j}{2}\right) + f(r_1)}{\dfrac{(r_j - r_1)^2}{2}} = \frac{f(r_j) - 2\, f(r_k) + f(r_1)}{\dfrac{(r_j - r_1)^2}{2}} = 0.$$

Suppose otherwise that $r_j = r_1$. Then $r_k = (r_1 + r_j)/2 = r_1$, which implies that $x = r_1$ is a root of f with multiplicity greater than 2. Thus $f(r_1) = f'(r_1) = f''(r_1) = 0$. It follows that

$$f_1(r_1, r_j) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{f^{(k+1)}(r_1)}{(k+1)!}(r_j - r_1)^k = f'(r_1) = 0,$$
$$f_3(r_1, r_j) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \left(2 - \frac{1}{2^k}\right) \frac{f^{(k+2)}(r_1)}{(k+2)!}\,(r_j - r_1)^k = \frac{f''(r_1)}{2!} = 0.$$

Hence, in both cases we have $f_1(r_1, r_j) = f_3(r_1, r_j) = 0$. Therefore

$$F(r_1) = A_1(r_1, r_j) f_1(r_1, r_j) + A_3(r_1, r_j) f_3(r_1, r_j) = 0,$$

so $r_1 - 2\, r_k + r_j$ divides $F(r_1)$. □

Proof of Theorem 3. By Lemma 4, $(r_1 - 2\, r_k + r_j) \mid F(r_1)$ for arbitrarily chosen k, j with $1 < k \neq j$. Hence

$$\prod_{1<k\neq j} (r_1 - 2\, r_k + r_j) \mid F(r_1).$$

It follows from the theory of resultants [4, p. 398] that

$$E = \prod_{i=1}^{n} F(r_i) = \prod_{i<j\neq k} (r_i - 2\, r_k + r_j)^2 \cdot K = D_2^2 \cdot K$$

for some polynomial K in $r_1, \ldots, r_n$. By Proposition 5, there exist a nonzero constant c and an integer $q \geq 2$ such that $E = c\, D_2^q$.

On the other hand, by Lemma 11, $\deg(E, \boldsymbol{a}) \leq 3\,(n-1)(n-2)+2\,(n-2)$; by Proposition 3, $\deg(D_2, \boldsymbol{a}) = 3\,(n-1)(n-2)/2$. Under these constraints, the only possibility for $E = c\, D_2^q$ to hold is that K is a constant and $q = 2$. □

6. The Second Discriminant with Ideals

In searching for explicit representations of D_2 in terms of the coefficients of f, we have discovered the amazingly structured matrix M formed with the derivatives of f shown in (3). In what follows, we establish an inherent connection between the $(n-2)$th leading principal minor H of M and $\mathrm{res}(f_1, f_3, y)$, which reveals the hidden mystery for the structure of M.

Let $\langle f_1, \ldots, f_m \rangle$ denote the ideal generated by $f_1, \ldots, f_m$ in a ring of polynomials. The polynomials $f_1, \ldots, f_m$ are called the generators of the ideal.

Lemma 5.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\langle f(x), f(y), f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right), w(x-y)-1\right\rangle \\
&\qquad = \left\langle f(x), f(y)-f(x), f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right)-f(x), w(x-y)-1\right\rangle \\
&\qquad = \langle f(x), f_1(x,y), f_2(x,y), w(x-y)-1\rangle \\
&\qquad = \langle f(x), f_1(x,y), f_3(x,y), w(x-y)-1\rangle .
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let the four ideals in the above identity be denoted successively by $\mathcal{I}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{I}_4$. It is obvious that $\mathcal{I}_1 = \mathcal{I}_2$. We only need to show that $\mathcal{I}_2 = \mathcal{I}_3$ and $\mathcal{I}_3 = \mathcal{I}_4$.

(1) Since $f(y) - f(x) = f_1 \cdot (y-x)$ and $f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) - f(x) = f_2 \cdot \frac{y-x}{2}$, we have $\mathcal{I}_2 \subset \mathcal{I}_3$. On the other hand,

$$f_1 = -w\,[f(y)-f(x)] - [w(x-y)-1]\frac{f(y)-f(x)}{y-x},$$

$$f_2 = -2\,w\left[f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right)-f(x)\right] - 2\,[w(x-y)-1]\frac{f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right)-f(x)}{y-x},$$

so $\mathcal{I}_3 \subset \mathcal{I}_2$.

(2) $\mathcal{I}_3 \subset \mathcal{I}_4$ follows from $f_2 = f_1 + \frac{x-y}{2}\cdot f_3$. $\mathcal{I}_4 \subset \mathcal{I}_3$ can be easily deduced from $f_3 = -2\,wf_1 + 2\,wf_2 - f_3[w(x-y)-1]$.

Therefore $\mathcal{I}_1 = \mathcal{I}_2 = \mathcal{I}_3 = \mathcal{I}_4$. □

Lemma 6. *Let*

$$g_1(x,y) = f_1(x-y, x+y), \quad g_3(x,y) = f_3(x-y, x+y), \quad G = \operatorname{res}(g_1, g_3, y).$$

Then $G = H^2$, where H is as in Theorem 2.

Proof. For any rational number γ, denote by $\lfloor\gamma\rfloor$ the biggest integer that is not greater than γ. Taking Taylor expansion for g_1 and g_3 at x, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
g_1(x,y) &= \frac{f(x+y)-f(x-y)}{2\,y} \\
&= \frac{f(x+y)-f(x)}{2\,y} - \frac{f(x-y)-f(x)}{2\,y} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left[1-(-1)^k\right]\frac{f^{(k)}(x)}{k!}y^{k-1} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor\frac{n-1}{2}\rfloor}\frac{f^{(2\,k+1)}(x)}{(2\,k+1)!}y^{2\,k}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} g_3(x,y) &= \frac{f(x+y)+f(x-y)-2\,f(x)}{2\,y^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\,y}\cdot\left[\frac{f(x+y)-f(x)}{y}+\frac{f(x-y)-f(x)}{y}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=2}^{n}\left[1+(-1)^k\right]\frac{f^{(k)}(x)}{k!}y^{k-2} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor\frac{n}{2}\rfloor-1}\frac{f^{(2\,k+2)}(x)}{(2\,k+2)!}y^{2\,k}. \end{aligned}$$

Let g_1^* and g_3^* be obtained from g_1 and g_3 by replacing y^2 with z. Then

$$\mathrm{res}(g_1^*,g_3^*,z)=\left|\begin{array}{cccc} \frac{f^{(n-1)}}{(n-1)!} & \frac{f^{(n-3)}}{(n-3)!} & \frac{f^{(n-5)}}{(n-5)!} & \cdots\cdots \\ 0 & \frac{f^{(n-1)}}{(n-1)!} & \frac{f^{(n-3)}}{(n-3)!} & \cdots\cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots\ddots \\ \frac{f^{(n)}}{n!} & \frac{f^{(n-2)}}{(n-2)!} & \frac{f^{(n-4)}}{(n-4)!} & \cdots\cdots \\ 0 & \frac{f^{(n)}}{n!} & \frac{f^{(n-2)}}{(n-2)!} & \cdots\cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots\ddots \end{array}\right|\begin{array}{l} \left.\begin{array}{l}\\\\\\\end{array}\right\} \left\lfloor\frac{n}{2}\right\rfloor-1 \\ \left.\begin{array}{l}\\\\\\\end{array}\right\} \left\lfloor\frac{n-1}{2}\right\rfloor \end{array} = \pm\,H.$$

Therefore,

$$G=\mathrm{res}(g_1,g_3,y)=[\mathrm{res}(g_1^*(x,z),g_3^*(x,z),z)]^2=H^2.$$

□

Corollary 1. $D_2\in\langle f(x),g_1(x,y),g_3(x,y)\rangle\cap\mathbb{Q}[a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}]$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{K}=\mathbb{Q}[a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}]$. By Lemma 6,

$$\mathrm{res}(f,G,x)=\mathrm{res}(f,H^2,x)=D_2^2.$$

According to the theory of resultants, there exist $A_1(x,z),A_2(x,z)\in\mathcal{K}[x,z]$ such that

$$H=A_1(x,z)g_1^*(x,z)+A_2(x,z)g_3^*(x,z).$$

Similarly, there exist $B_1(x),B_2(x)\in\mathcal{K}[x]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} D_2 &= \mathrm{res}(f,H,x)=B_1(x)f(x)+B_2(x)H \\ &= B_1(x)f(x)+B_2(x)[A_1(x,z)g_1^*(x,z)+A_2(x,t)g_3^*(x,z)]. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting $z=y^2$, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} D_2 &= B_1(x)f(x)+A_1(x,y^2)B_2(x)g_1(x,y)+A_2(x,y^2)B_2(x)g_3(x,y) \\ &\in \langle f,g_1,g_3\rangle\cap\mathcal{K}. \end{aligned}$$

The corollary is proved. □

Theorem 4. $D_2\in\langle f(x),f_1(x,y),f_3(x,y)\rangle\cap\mathbb{Q}[a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}]$.

Proof. Replace x and y in $f(x)$, $f_1(x-y,x+y)$, $f_3(x-y,x+y)$ by $(Y+X)/2$ and $(Y-X)/2$, respectively. Since $D_2 \in \langle f(x), f_1(x-y,x+y), f_3(x-y,x+y)\rangle$ and D_2 does not involve x and y,

$$D_2 \in \left\langle f\left(\frac{X+Y}{2}\right), f_1(X,Y), f_3(X,Y)\right\rangle.$$

Furthermore, from

$$f\left(\frac{X+Y}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{2}(Y-X)^2 f_3(X,Y) + \frac{1}{2}(Y-X)f_1(X,Y) + f(X,Y),$$

one can deduce

$$\langle f(X), f_1(X,Y), f_3(X,Y)\rangle = \left\langle f\left(\frac{X+Y}{2}\right), f_1(X,Y), f_3(X,Y)\right\rangle.$$

Therefore,

$$D_2 \in \langle f(X), f_1(X,Y), f_3(X,Y)\rangle.$$

Substitution of $X = x$ and $Y = y$ back to the above expression, we have

$$D_2 \in \langle f(x), f_1(x,y), f_3(x,y)\rangle.$$

The proof is complete. □

Corollary 2.

$$D_2 \in \left\langle f(x), f(y), f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right), w(x-y)-1\right\rangle \cap \mathbb{Q}[a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}].$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 5 and Theorem 4. □

Proposition 6.

$$\langle D_2\rangle = \left\langle f(x), f(y), f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right), w(x-y)-1\right\rangle \cap \mathbb{Q}[a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}].$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I}_1$ and $\mathcal{I}_4$ be as in the proof of Lemma 5, which implies that

$$\mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{K} = \mathcal{I}_4 \cap \mathcal{K},$$

where $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{Q}[a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}]$. We proceed to show that $\langle D_2\rangle = \mathcal{I}_4 \cap \mathcal{K}$.

Since $E = \mathrm{res}(f, \mathrm{res}(f_1, f_3, y), x)$, $E \in \mathcal{I}_4 \cap \mathcal{K}$. Let $(\bar{a}_0,\ldots,\bar{a}_{n-1},\bar{x},\bar{y},\bar{w})$ be any zero of $\mathcal{I}_4$ and h be any polynomial in $\mathcal{I}_4 \cap \mathcal{K}$. Then $E(\bar{a}_0,\ldots,\bar{a}_{n-1}) = h(\bar{a}_0,\ldots,\bar{a}_{n-1}) = 0$. By Theorem 4, $D_2(\bar{a}_0,\ldots,\bar{a}_{n-1}) = 0$, so D_2 and h have a nonconstant common divisor. As D_2 is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$, $D_2 \mid h$.

On the other hand, by Corollary 2

$$D_2 \in \left\langle f(x), f(y), f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right), w(x-y)-1\right\rangle = \mathcal{I}_1 = \mathcal{I}_4.$$

Since $D_2 \mid h$ for any $h \in \mathcal{I}_4 \cap \mathcal{K}$, the intersection $\mathcal{I}_4 \cap \mathcal{K}$ is a principal ideal generated by D_2. Therefore,

$$\langle D_2\rangle = \mathcal{I}_4 \cap \mathcal{K} = \mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}.$$

□

Proposition 7. *Let s_i be the elementary symmetric polynomial of degree i in $r_1, \ldots, r_n$ and $v_i = a_{n-i} - (-1)^i s_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Then*

$$\Big\langle \prod_{i<j\neq k} (2\,r_k - r_i - r_j),\ v_1, \ldots, v_n \Big\rangle \cap \mathbb{Q}[a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}]$$
$$= \langle 2\,r_1 - r_2 - r_3,\ v_1, \ldots, v_n \rangle \cap \mathbb{Q}[a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}] = \langle D_2 \rangle\,.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{Q}[a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}]$ as before and

$$\mathcal{J}_1 = \left\langle \prod_{i<j\neq k} (2\,r_k - r_i - r_j),\ v_1, \ldots, v_n \right\rangle \cap \mathcal{K},$$
$$\mathcal{J}_2 = \langle 2\,r_1 - r_2 - r_3,\ v_1, \ldots, v_n \rangle \cap \mathcal{K}.$$

Proof of $\mathcal{J}_1 = \langle D_2 \rangle$. Note first that each v_i $(1 \le i \le n)$ is a polynomial monic and linear in a_{n-i}. Dividing D_2 by $v_n, \ldots, v_1$ with respect to $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ respectively, one can obtain a remainder R in $r_1, \ldots, r_n$. Then there exist polynomials $A_1, \ldots, A_n \in \mathbb{Q}[a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}, r_1, \ldots, r_n]$ such that

$$D_2 = A_1 v_1 + \cdots + A_n v_n + R.$$

Substituting $a_{n-i} = (-1)^i s_i$ into the above formula and by Theorem 2, we have

$$R = \prod_{i<j\neq k} (2\,r_k - r_i - r_j).$$

Therefore, D_2 can be written as a linear combination of polynomials in $\mathcal{J}_1$. This implies that $D_2 \in \mathcal{J}_1$ and thus $\langle D_2 \rangle \subset \mathcal{J}_1$.

To show that $\mathcal{J}_1 \subset \langle D_2 \rangle$, let h be any polynomial in $\mathcal{J}_1$. Then the greatest common divisor $\gcd(h, D_2)$ of h and D_2 is contained in the ideal $\mathcal{J}_1$. As D_2 is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$, $\gcd(h, D_2)$ is either a nonzero constant, or equal to D_2. If $\gcd(h, D_2)$ is a nonzero constant, then $\mathcal{J}_1$ is equal to the unit ideal, which is not possible because for any $r_1, \ldots, r_n$ satisfying $\prod_{i<j\neq k}(2\,r_k - r_i - r_j) = 0$, there always exist $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ such that $v_1 = \cdots = v_n = 0$, i.e., $\mathcal{J}_1$ always has zeros. Therefore, $\gcd(h, D_2) = D_2$ and $D_2 \mid h$. It follows that $h \in \langle D_2 \rangle$.

Proof of $\mathcal{J}_1 = \mathcal{J}_2$. Since $\mathcal{J}_1 \subset \mathcal{J}_2$ holds obviously, we only need to show that $\mathcal{J}_2 \subset \mathcal{J}_1$. Observe that

$$\mathcal{J}_1 \supset \bigcap_{i<j\neq k} \langle 2\,r_k - r_i - r_j,\, v_1, \ldots, v_n \rangle \cap \mathcal{K}.$$

Since $\mathcal{J}_1 = \langle D_2 \rangle$ is a prime ideal, there exist $i < j \neq k$ such that

$$\mathcal{J}_1 \supset \mathcal{J}_{ijk} = \langle 2\,r_k - r_i - r_j,\ v_1, \ldots, v_n \rangle \cap \mathcal{K}$$

and $\mathcal{J}_{ijk}$ is prime. Note that $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ are symmetric in $r_1, \ldots, r_n$. Hence the primality of $\mathcal{J}_{ijk}$ implies the primality of $\mathcal{J}_{\imath\jmath\kappa}$ for all $\imath < \jmath \neq \kappa$. Therefore, all the $\mathcal{J}_{\imath\jmath\kappa}$ are identical. Hence

$$\mathcal{J}_1 \supset \mathcal{J}_2 = \langle 2\,r_1 - r_2 - r_3,\ v_1, \ldots, v_n \rangle \cap \mathcal{K}.$$

□

As shown by Propositions 6 and 7, there are several ideals with different generators whose intersections with $\mathcal{K}$ are equal to $\langle D_2 \rangle$. The generator D_2 of the principal ideal $\langle D_2 \rangle$, which is an *elimination ideal* of $\mathcal{I}_1 = \cdots = \mathcal{I}_4$ or $\mathcal{J}_1 = \mathcal{J}_2$, can be obtained by computing the reduced lexicographical Gröbner basis of any of the ideals $\mathcal{I}_\imath$ and $\mathcal{J}_\jmath$ (see [2, Lemma 6.8]).

7. Degrees of Some Determinant Polynomials

The two determinant polynomials H and $F = \mathrm{res}(f_1, f_3, y)$, defined in Theorem 2 and Proposition 5 respectively, can be used for the construction of the second discriminant D_2. In what follows, we provide some simple formulas for the exact degrees of H and F in x, which may be used for complexity analysis of D_2.

Lemma 7. $\deg(H, x) \le (n-1)(n-2)/2$.

Proof. Let g_1, g_3 and g_1^*, g_3^* be as Lemma 6 and its proof. Then

$$G = \mathrm{res}(g_1, g_3, y) = [\mathrm{res}(g_1^*(x,z), g_3^*(x,z), z)]^2 = H^2,$$

where H is as in Theorem 2. Now consider

$$\Delta(\boldsymbol{a}, x, y, \alpha) = \begin{vmatrix} g_1(x,y) & g_3(x,y) \\ g_1(x,\alpha) & g_3(x,\alpha) \end{vmatrix} \Big/ (y-\alpha)$$

and let $\boldsymbol{\nu} = (x, y, \alpha)$ and $\tilde{n} = 2\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$. It is easy to see that Δ is of degree $2n-4$ in $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ and $\deg(\Delta, \alpha) = \deg(\Delta, y) = \tilde{n} - 1$, $\deg(\Delta, \boldsymbol{a}) \le 2$. Let Δ be written as

$$\Delta = \sum_{\substack{0 \le i \le 2n-4 \\ 0 \le j,k \le \tilde{n}-1}} \delta_{ijk} x^i y^j \alpha^k.$$

Then for every term $x^i y^j \alpha^k$ occurring in Δ, $i+j+k \le \deg(\Delta, \boldsymbol{\nu}) = 2n-4$, so $i \le 2n-4-j-k$.

Denote by

$$B = (b_{j+1,k+1}) = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{2n-4} \delta_{ijk} x^i \right)$$

the $\tilde{n} \times \tilde{n}$ Bézout matrix of g_1 and g_3 with respect to y. It follows that $\deg(b_{jk}, x) \le 2n-2-j-k$. Let $(k_1, \ldots, k_{\tilde{n}})$ denote an arbitrary permutation of $(1, \ldots, \tilde{n})$ and $\bar{G} = \det(B)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 2\deg(H,x) &= \deg(H^2, x) = \deg(G, x) = \deg(\bar{G}, x) \\ &\le \max_{(k_1,\ldots,k_{\tilde{n}})} \deg(b_{1k_1} \cdots b_{\tilde{n}\, k_{\tilde{n}-1}}, x) = \max_{(k_1,\ldots,k_{\tilde{n}})} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{n}} \deg(b_{jk_j}, x) \\ &\le \max_{(k_1,\ldots,k_{\tilde{n}})} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{n}} [2n-2-j-k_j] = (2n-2)\cdot\tilde{n} - \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{n}} j - \min_{(k_1,\ldots,k_{\tilde{n}})} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{n}} k_j \\ &= (2n-2)\cdot\tilde{n} - (\tilde{n}+1)\cdot\tilde{n} = (n-1)(n-2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\deg(H, x) \le (n-1)(n-2)/2$. □

Lemma 7 provides an upper bound for $\deg(H, x)$. In what follows, we show that the bound can be achieved for a particular polynomial. Thus the degree of H constructed from the generic form of f is equal to the bound.

Lemma 8. *For $a_0 = \cdots = a_{n-1} = 0$, $\deg(H, x) = (n-1)(n-2)/2$.*

Proof. When $a_0 = \cdots = a_{n-1} = 0$, H becomes the $(n-2)$th leading principal minor of the following matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} C_n^2 x^{n-2} & C_n^4 x^{n-4} & C_n^6 x^{n-6} & \cdots\cdots \\ C_n^1 x^{n-1} & C_n^3 x^{n-3} & C_n^5 x^{n-5} & \cdots\cdots \\ 0 & C_n^2 x^{n-2} & C_n^4 x^{n-4} & \cdots\cdots \\ 0 & C_n^1 x^{n-1} & C_n^3 x^{n-3} & \cdots\cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

Simple calculation shows that

$$\begin{vmatrix} C_n^2 x^{n-2} & C_n^4 x^{n-4} & C_n^6 x^{n-6} & \cdots\cdots \\ C_n^1 x^{n-1} & C_n^3 x^{n-3} & C_n^5 x^{n-5} & \cdots\cdots \\ 0 & C_n^2 x^{n-2} & C_n^4 x^{n-4} & \cdots\cdots \\ 0 & C_n^1 x^{n-1} & C_n^3 x^{n-3} & \cdots\cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{vmatrix}$$

$$\begin{matrix} \mathrm{co}_1 \div x^{n-2} \\ \mathrm{co}_2 \div x^{n-4}, \mathrm{co}_{n-2} \times x^{n-4} \\ \mathrm{co}_3 \div x^{n-3}, \mathrm{co}_{n-3} \times x^{n-3} \\ \cdots \\ \hline\hline \\ \mathrm{ro}_2 \div x \\ \cdots \\ \mathrm{ro}_{n-2} \div x^{n-3} \end{matrix} \begin{vmatrix} C_n^2 & C_n^4 & C_n^6 & \cdots\cdots \\ C_n^1 & C_n^3 & C_n^5 & \cdots\cdots \\ 0 & C_n^2 & C_n^4 & \cdots\cdots \\ 0 & C_n^1 & C_n^3 & \cdots\cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{vmatrix} x^{(n-2)+1+2+\cdots+(n-3)}$$

$$= \begin{vmatrix} C_n^2 & C_n^4 & C_n^6 & \cdots\cdots \\ C_n^1 & C_n^3 & C_n^5 & \cdots\cdots \\ 0 & C_n^2 & C_n^4 & \cdots\cdots \\ 0 & C_n^1 & C_n^3 & \cdots\cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{vmatrix} x^{\frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}} \doteq c_n x^{\frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}}.$$

In what follows, we prove that $c_n \neq 0$.

Let

$$U = C_n^2 z^2 + C_n^4 z^4 + \cdots + C_n^{2\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} z^{2\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor},$$
$$V = C_n^1 z + C_n^3 z^3 + \cdots + C_n^{2\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor - 1} z^{2\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor - 1},$$

and $\bar{U}$ and $\bar{V}$ be obtained from U/z^2 and V/z, respectively, by replacing z^2 with t. Then $c_n = \pm \operatorname{res}(\bar{U}, \bar{V}, t)$. If $c_n = 0$, then U/z^2 and V/z have at least one common zero, say $\bar{z}$, where $\bar{z} \neq 0$. Note that

$$U + V = (z+1)^n - C_n^0.$$

Substituting $z = \bar{z}$ into the above equation, we have $(\bar{z}+1)^n - 1 = 0$. Similarly, $(U-V)|_{z=\bar{z}} = (\bar{z}-1)^n - 1 = 0$. Therefore, there exist two unit roots u_1, u_2 such that $\bar{z}+1 = u_1$ and $\bar{z}-1 = u_2$, which leads to $u_1 - u_2 = 2$. In other words, u_1 and u_2 have the same imaginary part and the difference of their real parts is 2. This can happen only when $u_1 = 1$ and

$u_2 = -1$. Therefore, $\bar{z} = 0$, which leads to contradiction since $\bar{z}$ is nonzero. Hence the conclusion holds. □

The following theorem follows from Lemmas 7 and 8.

Theorem 5. $\deg(H, x) = (n-1)(n-2)/2$.

Similarly, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 6. $\deg(F, x) = (n-1)(n-2)$.

This theorem is established by proving the following two lemmas.

Lemma 9. $\deg(F, x) \leq (n-1)(n-2)$.

Proof. Let

$$\Delta(\boldsymbol{a}, x, y, \alpha) = \begin{vmatrix} f_1(x,y) & f_3(x,y) \\ f_1(x,\alpha) & f_3(x,\alpha) \end{vmatrix} \Big/ (y-\alpha)$$

and $\boldsymbol{\nu} = (x, y, \alpha)$. It is easy to see that Δ is of degree $2\,n-4$ in $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ and $\deg(\Delta, \alpha) = \deg(\Delta, y) = n-2$, $\deg(\Delta, \boldsymbol{a}) \leq 2$. Let Δ be written as

$$\Delta = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq 2n-4 \\ 0 \leq j,\, k \leq n-2}} \delta_{ijk} x^i y^j \alpha^k.$$

Then for every term $x^i y^j \alpha^k$ occurring in Δ, $i+j+k \leq \deg(\Delta, \boldsymbol{\nu}) = 2\,n-4$, so $i \leq 2\,n-4-j-k$.

Denote by

$$B = (b_{j+1,k+1}) = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{2n-4} \delta_{ijk} x^i \right)$$

the $(n-1)\times(n-1)$ Bézout matrix of f_1 and f_3 with respect to y. It follows that $\deg(b_{jk}, x) \leq 2\,n-2-j-k$. Let $(k_1, \ldots, k_{n-1})$ denote an arbitrary permutation of $(1, \ldots, n-1)$ and $\bar{F} = \det(B)$. According to the theory of resultants [1], $F = \mathrm{res}(f_1, f_3, y) = \pm\bar{F}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(F, x) &= \deg(\bar{F}, x) \leq \max_{(k_1,\ldots,k_{n-1})} \deg(b_{1k_1} \cdots b_{n-1,k_{n-1}}, x) = \max_{(k_1,\ldots,k_{n-1})} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \deg(b_{jk_j}, x) \\ &\leq \max_{(k_1,\ldots,k_{n-1})} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (2\,n-2-j-k_j) = (2\,n-2)(n-1) - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} j - \min_{(k_1,\ldots,k_{n-1})} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j \\ &= 2\,(n-1)^2 - (n-1)n = (n-1)(n-2). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 10. *For $a_0 = \cdots = a_{n-1} = 0$, $\deg(F, x) = (n-1)(n-2)$.*

Proof. When $a_0 = \cdots = a_{n-1} = 0$, $f = x^n$. We first prove that $x = 0$ is equivalent to $F = 0$.

($\Longrightarrow$) If $x = 0$, then $f_1 = y^{n-1}$ and $f_3 = \left(2 - 1/2^{n-2}\right) y^{n-2}$. In this case, f_1 and f_3 have a common zero and thus $F = 0$.

($\Longleftarrow$) Let $F = 0$; then f_1 and f_3 have at least one common zero for y, say $\bar{y}$. Then

$$f_1(x, \bar{y}) = \frac{\bar{y}^n - x^n}{\bar{y} - x} = 0, \quad f_3(x, \bar{y}) = \frac{\bar{y}^n - 2\left(\dfrac{\bar{y}+x}{2}\right)^n + x^n}{\dfrac{(\bar{y}-x)^2}{2}} = 0.$$

Suppose that $x \neq 0$ and let $\bar{t} = \bar{y}/x$. Then the above equalities imply that

$$\bar{t}^n = 1, \quad \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\bar{t}\right)^n = 1.$$

Therefore, there exist two unit roots u_1 and u_2 such that $\bar{t} = u_1$ and $(1+\bar{t})/2 = u_2$, which implies that $u_2 = (1+u_1)/2$. This can happen only when $u_1 = u_2 = 1$; so $\bar{y} = x$. Thus

$$f_1(x, \bar{y}) = \frac{y^n - x^n}{y - x} = x^{n-1} + x^{n-2}\bar{y} + \cdots + x\bar{y}^{n-2} + x\bar{y}^{n-1} = nx^{n-1} = 0,$$

which implies that $x = 0$. This contradicts the assumption that $x \neq 0$. Therefore, $x = 0$.

Since $x = 0$ and $F = 0$ are equivalent, there exist a nonzero constant c and an integer $N \geq 1$ such that $F = c\,x^N$. It remains to show that $N = (n-1)(n-2)$.

Let

$$\Delta(x, y, \alpha) = \begin{vmatrix} f_1(x,y) & f_3(x,y) \\ f_1(x,\alpha) & f_3(x,\alpha) \end{vmatrix} \Big/ (y - \alpha)$$

and $\boldsymbol{\nu} = (x, y, \alpha)$. It is easy to see that Δ is homogeneous of degree $2\,n-4$ in $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ and $\deg(\Delta, \alpha) = \deg(\Delta, y) = n-2$. Let Δ be written as

$$\Delta = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq 2n-4 \\ 0 \leq j,\, k \leq n-2}} \delta_{ijk} x^i y^j \alpha^k.$$

Then for every term $x^i y^j \alpha^k$ occurring in Δ, $i+j+k = \deg(\Delta, \boldsymbol{\nu}) = 2\,n-4$, so $i = 2\,n-4-j-k$.

Denote by

$$B = (b_{j+1,k+1}) = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{2n-4} \delta_{ijk} x^i\right)$$

the $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ Bézout matrix of f_1 and f_3 with respect to y and let $\bar{F} = \det(B)$. According to the theory of resultants [1], $F = \mathrm{res}(f_1, f_3, y) = \pm\bar{F}$, so $\deg(\bar{F}, x) \geq 1$.

Note that for any entry b_{jk} in B, either $b_{jk} = 0$ or $\deg(b_{jk}, x) = 2\,n-2-j-k$. Let $(k_1, \ldots, k_{n-1})$ denote an arbitrary permutation of $(1, \ldots, n-1)$. Then either $b_{1k_1} \cdots b_{n-1,k_{n-1}} = 0$, or

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(b_{1k_1} \cdots b_{n-1,k_{n-1}}, x) &= \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \deg(b_{jk_j}, x) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (2\,n-2-j-k_j) \\ &= (2\,n-2)(n-1) - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} j - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} k_j \\ &= 2\,(n-1)^2 - (n-1)n = (n-1)(n-2). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\bar{F} \neq 0$, so $\deg(\bar{F}, x) = (n-1)(n-2)$. It follows that $\deg(F, x) = (n-1)(n-2)$. □

The following lemma has been used for the proof of Theorem 3.

Lemma 11. $\deg(E, \boldsymbol{a}) \leq 3\,(n-1)(n-2) + 2\,(n-2)$.

Proof. Let $N = \deg(F, x)$; then $N \le (n-1)(n-2)$ according to Lemma 9. Moreover, from the proof of Lemma 9 we know that $\deg(F, \boldsymbol{a}) \le 2\,(n-2)$. Since E is a determinant formed with n rows of f-coefficients and N rows of F-coefficients, the degree of each f-coefficient is at most 1, and the degree of each F-coefficient is at most $2\,(n-2)$, the degree of E is at most $N \cdot 1 + n \cdot 2\,(n-2) \le 3\,(n-1)(n-2) + 2\,(n-2)$. The proof is complete. □

From Proposition 3 and Theorem 3 the following corollary follows.

Corollary 3. $\deg(E, \boldsymbol{a}) = 3\,(n-1)(n-2)$.

The result of this corollary allows us to reduce the upper bound $3\,(n-1)(n-2)+2\,(n-2)$ of $\deg(E, \boldsymbol{a})$ to $3\,(n-1)(n-2)$, the exact degree of E in $\boldsymbol{a}$, which is also the degree of D_2^2 in $\boldsymbol{a}$.

Remark 2. The determinant polynomials F and H are both irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}[\boldsymbol{a}]$. The irreducibility of H is obvious because $D_2 = \operatorname{res}(f, H, x)$ is irreducible and that of F can be proved by using the symmetry of $F(r_1)$ with respect to $r_2, \ldots, r_n$.[2] Hence F and H do not have any common divisor. On the other hand, G is obtained from f_1 and f_3 via linear transformation and resultant computation and F is connected to H via G by the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{res}(f, F, x) = \operatorname{res}(f, G, x) &= [\operatorname{res}(f, H, x)]^2, \\ \deg(F, x) = \deg(G, x) &= 2\,\deg(H, x), \end{aligned}$$

and $G = H^2$. However, it is unclear whether there is any direct connection between F and G. Note that F and thus D_2 are constructed from f, f_1, and f_3 naturally; yet the occurrence of the sequences of odd derivatives and even derivatives of f with respect to x in the determinant expressions of H and G remains uninterpretable. Meaningful interpretations of the occurrence might be figured out by exploring direct connections between F and G.

8. Application and Remarks

In this section, we illustrate the usefulness of the second discriminant by an application (to the classification of root configurations for the cubic polynomial) and discuss the possibility of introducing discriminants of higher order.

The form $r_i - r_j$ in D_1 can be viewed as the vector from r_j to r_i, considered as two points in the complex plane. Similarly, the form $2\,r_k - r_i - r_j$ in D_2 can be viewed as twice the vector from the middle point of r_i and r_j to r_k. The signs of D_1 and D_2 carry information about the distribution, position, and relative configuration of the roots $r_1, \ldots, r_n$ of f. Therefore, D_1 and D_2 can be used to explore such structural properties of the roots of f without exactly computing them out.

For the cubic polynomial $f = x^3 + a_2x^2 + a_1x + a_0$, we have the following Lagrange formula with radicals for its three roots:

$$r_1 = \frac{-a_2 + \omega^1 c_1 + \omega^2 c_2}{3}, \quad r_2 = \frac{-a_2 + \omega^0 c_1 + \omega^2 c_2}{3}, \quad r_3 = \frac{-a_2 + \omega^2 c_1 + \omega^1 c_2}{3},$$

[2]Let $F(\boldsymbol{a}, x) = F_1(\boldsymbol{a}, x)F_2(\boldsymbol{a}, x)$ with $\deg(F_1, x) \neq 0$. In this equality, substitution of x by r_1 and elimination of each a_i by using Vieta's formula yield $\bar{F}(r_1, \ldots, r_n) = \bar{F}_1(r_1, \ldots, r_n)\bar{F}_2(r_1, \ldots, r_n)$, where $\bar{F}$, $\bar{F}_1$, and $\bar{F}_2$ are all symmetric with respect to $r_2, \ldots, r_n$. From the proof of Theorem 3, one sees that $\bar{F} = c\prod_{k\neq j}(r_1 - 2\,r_k + r_j)$ for some constant c. Thus $\bar{F}_1$ has at least one divisor $r_1 - 2\,r_k + r_j$ for some $j \neq k$. The symmetry of $\bar{F}_1$ with respect to $r_2, \ldots, r_n$ implies that $\prod_{1<k\neq j}(r_1 - 2\,r_k + r_j)$ is also a divisor of $\bar{F}_1$. Therefore, $\bar{F}_1$ differs from $\bar{F}$ only by a nonzero constant, and so does F_1 from F. It follows that F_2 is a constant. This proves the irreducibility of F.

where $\omega = e^{\frac{2\pi}{3}\mathrm{i}} = -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\mathrm{i}$ and

$$c_1 = \sqrt[3]{(D_2 + 2\sqrt{-3\,D_1})/2}, \quad c_2 = \sqrt[3]{(D_2 - 2\sqrt{-3\,D_1})/2}.$$

Using the above formula, one can classify the roots of f into 9 types of configurations according to the signs of D_1 and D_2 as shown in Table 1 (cf. [9]).

Table 1. Types of configurations for the roots r_1, r_2, r_3 of the cubic polynomial f, where $\mathrm{Re}(r_1) \geq \mathrm{Re}(r_2) \geq \mathrm{Re}(r_3)$ and the red points of small, middle, and large sizes stand respectively for single, double, and triple roots of f.

	$D_2 < 0$	$D_2 = 0$	$D_2 > 0$
$D_1 > 0$	$r_1, r_2, r_3 \in \mathbb{R}$, $r_1 - r_2 < r_2 - r_3$	$r_1, r_2, r_3 \in \mathbb{R}$, $r_1 - r_2 = r_2 - r_3$	$r_1, r_2, r_3 \in \mathbb{R}$, $r_1 - r_2 > r_2 - r_3$
$D_1 = 0$	 $r_1, r_2, r_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ $r_1 = r_2 > r_3$	$r_1, r_2, r_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ $r_1 = r_2 = r_3$	 $r_1, r_2, r_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ $r_1 > r_2 = r_3$
$D_1 < 0$	 $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{C}, r_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ $\mathrm{Re}(r_1) = \mathrm{Re}(r_2) > r_3$	 $r_1, r_3 \in \mathbb{C}, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ $\mathrm{Re}(r_1) = \mathrm{Re}(r_2) = r_3$	 $r_2, r_3 \in \mathbb{C}, r_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ $r_1 > \mathrm{Re}(r_2) = \mathrm{Re}(r_3)$

The second discriminant can also be used in the root formula with radicals and to classify the types of configurations of the four roots for the general quartic polynomial. The classification in this case is somewhat involved and will be presented in a forthcoming paper [6].

The second discriminant of a univariate polynomial f, a concept we have introduced, is defined as the product of all possible linear forms $2\,r_k - r_i - r_j$ in the roots r_i, r_k, r_j of f with $i < j \neq k$, so its vanishing is a necessary and sufficient condition for f to have a symmetric triple of roots, i.e., a triple (r_i, r_k, r_j) of roots of f such that $r_k = (r_i + r_j)/2$. We have shown that the second discriminant of f can be expressed as the resultant of f and a determinant formed with the derivatives of f and it possesses several notable properties[3] and can be used to analyze the structure of the roots of f.

[3]Our experiments also show that, when $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ take integer values, $D_2 \not\equiv 2 \mod 4$ for $n > 3$.

We may naturally consider the product of linear forms in d roots of f for any $n \geq d \geq 4$. The product should be symmetric with respect to the n roots of f and the linear form should be chosen such that its vanishing constrains the d general roots of f to form a degenerate configuration which is geometrically interesting. Then one can try to establish conditions for f to have d roots forming the degenerate configuration.

For $n \geq d = 4$, linear forms of interest in four roots r_i, r_j, r_k, r_l of f could be taken of the following type

$$r_i + r_j - r_k - r_l, \quad \text{or} \quad 3\,r_l - r_i - r_j - r_k. \tag{8}$$

The former is twice the difference between the average of the two roots r_i and r_j and that of the two roots r_k and r_l, while the latter is three times the difference from the root r_l to the average of the three roots r_i, r_j, r_k. When the roots are considered as points in the complex plane, the average of two or three roots may be interpreted as the middle point or the centroid of the two or three points, respectively. Using the first linear form in (8), one may define

$$D_3 = \prod_{\substack{i \neq j \neq k \neq l \\ i < j, k < l, i < k}} (r_i + r_j - r_k - r_l).$$

For $n = 4$, D_3 can be expressed as a polynomial in the coefficients of f and this polynomial has been used in the root formula of f with radicals. How to express D_3 as a polynomial in the coefficients of f for arbitrary $n > 4$ and what properties D_3 may have are questions that remain for further investigation. Similar questions may be asked for D_3 defined by using the other linear form, and for D_4, D_5, ..., when they are properly defined.

It should be pointed out that the ideas and methodologies used in the study of D_2 provide a new approach to explore the properties of D_1. It may be generalized to investigate $D_3, D_4, \ldots$ and to discover other mysteries about the roots of f.

References

[1] Bézout, É.: *Théorie générale des équations algébriques*. Ph.D. thesis, Pierres, Paris (1779).

[2] Buchberger, B.: Gröbner bases: an algorithmic method in polynomial ideal theory. *Multidimensional Systems Theory*, pp. 184–232. Reidel, Dordrecht (1985).

[3] Cohen, H.: Resultants and discriminants. *A Course in Computational Algebraic Number Theory*, pp. 119–123. Springer, New York (1993).

[4] Gelfand, I. M., Kapranov, M. M., Zelevinsky, A. V.: *Discriminants, Resultants and Multidimensional Determinants*. Birkhäuser, Boston (1994).

[5] Gow, R.: Some properties and uses of the discriminant of a polynomial. *Irish Mathematical Society Bulletin*, 24, 12–19 (1990).

[6] Hong, H., Wang, D., Yang, J., Zhao, T.: Solution formulas for quartic equations without or with constraints. In preparation (2016).

[7] Mishra, B.: *Algorithmic Algebra*. Springer, New York (1993).

[8] Sylvester, J. J.: On a remarkable discovery in the theory of canonical forms and of hyperdeterminants. *Philosophical Magazine*, 4(2), 391–410 (1851).

[9] Zhao, T., Wang, D., Hong, H.: Solution formulas for cubic equations without or with constraints. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 46(8), 904–918 (2011).